

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/823,132	CHOJNACKI, ROBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkat Perungavoor	2432	

All Participants:

(1) Venkat Perungavoor.

(2) Jon Shutter.

Date of Interview: 13 October 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Obvious-type Double Patenting Rejecting

Claims discussed:

29-30,32,34-40,43-45, 47

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: after Final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 10:30 AM

/Venkat Perungavoor/
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated to the Applicants that instant invention can be rejected under obvious-type double patenting with US Patent 6768942, where the claims are both related to having an first encrypted part and second unencrypted part. And further the steps and function of both inventions are the same, albeit, '942 has more details in the claims to specify the invention, e.g. geographic database and navigation related features. That is, the instant application is a broader version of '942 patent. The Examiner advised the Applicant to file a terminal disclaimer to overcome the double patenting rejection.